IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 23052 of 1998

DATED: 24.1.2007

Between:

B.Srinivasa Reddy & others petitioners

And

The Member Secretary,APSEB

Vidyut Soudha, Hyderabad & another Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO. 23052 OF 1998

ORAL ORDER:

This writ petition is filed questioning the action of the respondents in not appointing the petitioners in terms of B.P. Ms. No. 36 dated 18.5.1997 as illegal.

The petitioners claim that they are working as Village Electricity Workers and eligible for absorption in to service in the 50% of existing vacancies in terms of B.P. Ms. No. 36 dated 18.5.1997. They were issued with interview call letters by second respondent and appeared before the selection committee on 23.9.1997. The petitioners allege that though they are eligible, their cases were not considered and the second respondent selected ineligible persons. Hence, the present writ petition.

A counter affidavit was filed on behalf of the respondents stating that in terms of interviews held on 23.9.1997 the names of the petitioners were included in the selection list. It is specifically stated that the seniority in the said list was fixed based on the number of man days put in by a candidate as Village Electricity Workers and the persons put in more number of man days than petitioners were appointed in the 50% of the existing vacancies and petitioners having put in less number of man days could not be appointed. The details of the man days put in by petitioners in comparison with the persons selected in the existing 50% of vacancies were given, which are as under;

	No. of man days put in by petitioner	No. of man days put in by the last person selected	Category in which selected
1st petitioner	1721	3925	O.C.
2nd petitioner	1295	3091	B.C
3rd petitioner	1356	3330	S.C
4th petitioner	1873	3126	S.T.

The above details would clearly indicate that the last candidate in each category of post has put in more number of man days in comparison to the petitioners herein. Thus, the allegation of the petitioners that their claim was not considered and second respondent appointed ineligible candidates and they were discriminated, cannot be accepted.

Hence, there are no merits in the writ petition warranting interference of this Court. The writ petition is devoid of any merits and is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

N.V.RAMANA,J

DATE: 24.1.2007

Tvk

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 23052 of 1998

DATED: 24.1.2007